

THE
Friendly Interposer,

BETWEEN THE

Authors of those *Papers*, the one called *A Report*; the other, *A Rebuke* of that *Report*.

IN ORDER TO

A Sound Reconciliation between the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* in Doctrinals, by the Proposal of a *Third Way*, when both of them in their own, are out.

By JOHN HUMFRET.

And Abraham said unto Lot, let there be no Strife I pray thee between Thee and Me, and between my Herdmen and thy Herdmen, for we are Brethren, Gen. 13. 8.

LONDON:

Printed for Thomas Parkhurst at the Bible and Three Crowns in Cheapside near Mercers Chapel, 1698.

1811

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
455 N. 5TH ST. N. Y. C.

THIS BOOK IS LOANED TO YOU BY THE

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

455 N. 5TH ST. N. Y. C.

NO. 1000

THE
Friendly Interposer, &c.

Mr. Report —

YOu have put out a Sheet Entituled, *a Report of the Present State of the Differences in Doctrinals, between some Dissenting Ministers in London*; and there is about five Sheets written in Answer to You, called *A Rebuke*. The Names of the Authors are concealed (which is best, for why should the Names of Brethren be clashed one against another) and I call you therefore Mr. Report upon that account, craving some of your Patience, as to a little I have to say to you. This *Antagonist* of yours is a smart Man I must needs say, and while he pleases himself, and others, and me, with his Wit, I would have you take part with us, and be pleased too, and moved no more than if it were writ on another Man. He is I confess too Magisterial, through an over Prejudice, and undervalue of him he writes against: But let that be your Advantage, for besides that, *Better is it to be humble in Spirit, than proud in Spirit*; it will be some *Victory* to you, if you be *unmoved*.

There are two things to be considered in this Book of his, what he hath *Ad hominem*, and what *Ad rem*.

Ad hominem, two things likewise are to be considered, what he tells, as the *Narrative* he gives (which is the chief business of his Book) for justifying the *Presbyterians*, and what he has to say in Particular in Reference to you.

For the *Narration* of Matters he gives us, I thank him. I believe every thing he says, and every thing you say, for neither of you I am assured will lye: Nevertheless, whether the Policy of the *Pisnair*, he so prettily applies to you in nibbling off something of the Story, be not incidental to him also I Question; because the chief Matter which made the noise, as to the Difference among you, which was the *Presbyterians* separating from the Lecture in *Pinner's-Hall* to another Place, is not accounted for by Mr. *Rebuke*.

not that it is done by either out of Falshood, but Caution, for avoiding ill Consequents, for in regard that neither of you, one or other; but do look upon the Breach effected, as an evil thing, and that they were faulty who made it; it is more advisable on all Hands, to endeavour rather to make up the Breach, and mend the Fault, than to trouble one another in finding out where it is most to be laid. If you can come to agree again, the twelve Elected Preachers should joyn in one Lecture in the old Place, that what proclaimed the *Division* may be the Token of your *Coalition*.

It appears by your *Sheet*, that there was six or seven of the more eminent of the *Presbyterians* that pitch upon the Printed Paper in that Sheet, as a means to bring both Parties, *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, to a Re-union; and they began themselves with the Subscribing it, but neither would the more Eminent of the *Independents*, nor the rest of the *Presbyterian* Brethren follow them; so that another Paper was provided by a single Person, and therefore rejected; and a *Third* Composed by such as were appointed for the Work; and this *Third Paper* is to be Proposed for an *Accommodation*.

What that *Third Paper* is I never saw, but supposing it such as is more satisfactory than either of the other; I will tell you what I think I should be bound to do, if I were you, in the Business. You are one that to bring your *Independent* Party in, have taken much Pains, and used so much Art, that you have lost that esteem of a *Pacificator* (as you call these six or seven before mentioned) and are thought to be the Person that undermines the *Union* which you pretend to Restore: You are therefore (knowing your own Conscience toward God and Peace) to let the Brethren know that seeing this way, which you and the six or seven wiser than you imagined, would have done the Deed, hath failed you; it shall not lye at your Door, but that another be tried; and (if upon reading their *Third Paper*, you find nothing in your Conscience against it) that you are the same Person, and concur with them in it, and with the same Resolution as you took up in your Letter to Dr. *Bates* concerning Mr. *Williams*; to wit, that if he would agree in his Doctrine with that *Doctor*, and the rest of the Brethren; you would Compound with him, if not yet with him, or without him, you would resolve, so far as you could, to get a Composition. It was bravely spoken then, if you do now the same thing in regard to your *Independent* Brethren; for seeing
Mr.

Mr. Williams is now come to Dr. Bates, or Dr. Bates to Mr. Williams (which is all one) in their Agreement on this *Third Paper*, together with the rest of the six or seven that Signed the first, and the Body of the Brethren of the *Presbyterians*; if there be any one or two *Independents*, or other stand out, and will not come in, you must let them alone; and be resolved, whether with them or without them, according to the most Christian Resolution of some worthy Brethren of both Perswasions, to come to a Coalition.

As for the other thing *Ad hominem*, which Mr. Rebuke has against you, it is your espousing so much as you do those Phrases (he calls them) of a *Commutation of Persons*, *Christ sustaining our Person*, putting on the Person of Sinners, and the like; which he says are only English Phrases, (though *induere*, and *exuere Personam alicujus* is good Latin, if your Sense) and while he makes so light of them as needless, and you so much, it is like you will be displeased: But I warn you of that, for seeing he does fully grant all that *Grotius*, and Bishop *Stillingsfleet* do understand by this *Commutation*, you must make these Phrases of more Signification than they, or else you stand upon meer Words, which is little. Besides, there is one thing I will say of Mr. Rebuke that you will hardly think I should. I do believe that he was one of the six or seven Eminent Brethren that Signed your first Paper for Healing, and yet does he set this Phrase in that Paper almost at naught, which you stand so much upon, because it is there. Here now will some say, we have a Man for a thing and against it; is not this base, to be so mutable? I say no, but this is generous, and free; and therefore so, upon that very account. For so long as any such Term, Word or Phrase was like to tend to the procuring Peace, he is free to let you make as much of it as you could, but when he sees it not conducive to the end, but the contrary, he is free to speak out himself, and make as little of it. If they were Words of Scripture, he would *captiveare intellectum* to some right Construction of them, but when they are only Terms of Men, he will be no Slave to any, but use them, or leave them, as Good or Evil is like to come of them. But to go on, Mr. Rebuke tells us, that there is neither in the Assemblies, nor any Confession of the Reformed Churches any such Phrase to be found, and I take it upon trust from him, because *Grotius* himself has not this Phrase full out; who says indeed, there is a *Commutatio*, a *subrogatio*, a *substitutio* (these Words he uses) of Christs Person in our room as to his Sufferings for us, *inst. ar. 1*, *vice nostra*,

in our stead, as the Sacrifice died in the stead of the Sinner that Sacrificed it; but a *Commutation of Persons* full out, he has not, nor any authority from the Ancients any farther than thus: *Deus pro animabus omnium dedit Commutationem pretiosum sanguinem filii sui*; which is *Origen*. *Dominus noster Iesus Christus communicando nobiscum sine culpa penam, & culpam solvit & penam*; which is *Augustine*. There is not a Quotation of his else, hath any touch of such a Phrase; and who shall come after *Grotius* to look for any thing he hath mist? I close therefore here with this Reverend Brother. *This Phrase* (says he) *of Christ's taking on him the Person of Sinners, does signifie more or less than Christ's taking on him our Sins, and suffering for them in our place or stead; or it does signifie neither more nor less, but is just commensurate with it. If you make it signifie less, then it limits and narrows the end of Christ's Suffering, and will be a sense only serving the turn of the Socinian: If you make it signifie more than that, it leads to Antinomianism: If it signifies (or be made to signifie) neither more nor less, I embrace it with all my Heart.* This Gentleman does still speak wittily; but here wittily and solidly, and I fully assent to it.

I won't say that you do, when we are now come from what he hath had, *ad hominem*, to what he should have *ad rem*. A Difference there is in *Doxtrinals*, as to this point, among the Brethren, and the business to be done, is to find the bottom of it, and to say something which is not said by this Brother, for satisfaction to it. It is true, that though there be no more to be put upon these Phrases, (I believe) than *Grotius*, and the aforesaid *Bishop* puts upon them; yet are there very Learned Men, such as among us are *Rutherford* and *Dr. Owen*, who I suppose, together with you, do lay more upon them than so, when there are others (if not they) do carry them so far as to hold this *Commutation* to be such, that from thence it is their account, not only that our Sins are laid upon Christ, but his Righteousness is communicated to us, which is making us to *sustain his Person*, as well as he *ours*, and we thereby made Righteous as he, in the Eye of the Law, or in Law-sense for our Justification. And this now I take to be another Matter.

If Christ obey'd the Law, and suffer'd for us in our behalf, or in our stead, so as God looks upon us to have suffered the Penalty of the Law in him to free us from Condemnation, and to have obeyed the Law in him to give us right to Heaven, which your *Commutation of Persons*, at the least must signifie; then are we in Christ inneed.

indeed *Legally* righteous, (for this is to be righteous in Law-sense, or in the Eye of the Law, that is *Legally so*, if they know what to be *Legally Righteous* is) and accordingly justified by the *Law* with his Righteousness, as our formal Righteousness, or as the *Form*, or *Formal Cause*, or *Reason* of our *Justification*. This is the Opinion, which in behalf of your *Independent Brethren*, you do and must maintain, as that which hath been received for the common *Protestant* Opinion heretofore, and if it be true, must bring your Adversaries over to you, or else if it be not true, both you and they must look for a righter, in a middle way between *Protestants* and *Papists*, which I doubt, the most of you are either too negligent to seek, or too conceited (through your own greater learning) to receive at another's Hands. *Sententia illorum qui Christi obedientiam & justitiam nobis imputatam statuunt esse formalem causam justificationis, communis est nostrorum omnium sententia, neque quod ad rem attinet, quisquam e nostris aliter sentit aut scripsit, says Darvenant, de Just. Flab. c. 22.*

Well now, if the Righteousness of Christ be indeed the *Formal Cause* of our Justification as this Learned Man, and most Judicious Man otherwise, does maintain for the received *Protestants* Doctrine, and which those *Independent Brethren*, who upon the account of *Doctrinals*, hang off from *Union* with the *Presbyterians*, will approve, or else they know not what they would have to strive for, then must we be *Legally righteous* in Christ, and so justified by the *Law*. And if the *Believer* be in Christ *Legally righteous*, then must Christ's Righteousness be the *Formal Cause* of his Justification. They that say one, must say the other; and they that deny the one, must deny the other, if they understand fundamentally what they are to affirm or deny. The *Papists* held inherent Grace, as infused to be the *Form* or *Formal Cause* of our Justification: The *Protestants* in opposition maintain'd, That Christ's Righteousness without us, and not ours within us, imputed to us, is that which *formally* justifies us. To be justified then by Christ's Righteousness, is to be righteous in Christ in *Law-sense*; and to be righteous in Christ in *Law-sense*, or in the Eye of the Law, is to be look'd on by God to have undergone the Penalty of the Law in Christ's Sufferings, and obeyed the Law in Christ's Obedience, and this infers a *Communion* of *Persons* in the highest sense, which you and your *Brethren* do indeed intend by it.

Here then we are come to the bottom which the Reverend and Ingenious Mr. *Rebuke* has not sounded, and here is the Quest-

on upon which the fundamental Difference between you, in the behalf of the *Independants* and your Adversaries, does bottom. If this Doctrine be true, then must the Consequences of it be true? If the Consequences be not good, the Doctrine must not be good neither.

Let us then come Hand to Hand to the Tryal. If your Doctrine be true, That there is such a Commutation of *Persons* as that God does look on us in Christ's Person, to have suffered the Punishment, and obeyed the Law; and so to be in him *Legally righteous* and justified by his Righteousness *Formaliter*, according to the Law of Works, then must his Righteousness be ours; so that in a Legal sense, we must be as righteous as he, or God must look on us in him as *righteous as he*, and then can God see no sin in the Believer, and the Believer have no need of Repentance, or other Righteousness, with the like Inferences, which we utterly condemn (however by the most pious of them mitigated) in the *Antinomian*. The Consequence really is not to be denied, unless by outfacing it with number, or shifting. Mr. *Anthony Burgess* acknowledges, if we be *formally* justified by Christ's Righteousness, then are we as righteous as he; and therefore he will have his Righteousness to be the *Matter*, not the *Form* of our Justification: And *Amesius* being put to it by this Objection from *Bellarmino*, apprehends the Consequence so irrefragable, that he recedes from the Doctrine. *Hæc non est nostra sententia*, (says he hereupon) though *Davenant* you see before, does stoutly affirm the contrary. And when it becomes necessary to recede from *this Doctrine*, it is fit we find out *another* that will hold better together.

If in good earnest you will maintain this *Doctrine of Commutation*, so that you understand no less by it than this, That Christ hath obey'd and suffer'd in our Person, that the Law is obeyed and satisfied by us in him, or we Legally righteous in him (which is all one,) I argue farther, as in my *Pacification*, and who shall answer it? If this were so, Then should we not our selves obey at all, Then should we not suffer at all; for he that hath perfectly obeyed, can be punished for nothing; Then should we need no forgiveness; Then would Christ's Sufferings for us, having obey'd, be needless; Then must he be look'd on by God as a sinner; Then must the *Culpa* as well as the *Paena* be imputed to him; Then could not Christ be our Mediator, because he is look'd on as the Offending Party, and a Mediator is a third Party between the Offender and the Offended, in which Person he obeyed and suffered for us; Then lastly,
should

should Impunity and Life be due to us immediately by a meer resultantcy from his Obedience and Sufferings, and not be given by the interposition of a new Law or Covenant upon Terms as they are according to the Gospel, which is subverted therefore by this Opinion.

I pray then Mr. Report will you sit down a little with me and consider what you would have by this *Commutation of Persons*, and see if it will hold. There are two Points according to you depend upon it, which are the principal Points in the Christian Religion; to wit, *Christ's Satisfaction*, and *our Justification*. But here it is that you are out with the Brethren, and the excellent Dr. Owen, who all of you do build this *Commutation of Persons*, upon that Union with Christ, which we call the *Mystical Union* between Christ and the Elect Believer, by vertue whereof, and not otherwise, Christ's Righteousness (you count) becomes theirs for their Justification. But, Sir, this cannot be; for if Christ's Righteousness be ours, as thus *One with him*, then must it be one and the same Righteousness, and we righteous as he (as before in God's Eye, or in the Eye of the Law, which is all one. His Righteousness is imputed *in se*, and we justified by the Law with his Righteousness (as I have said) as the *Form* it self, or *Formal Cause* of our Justification.

That being observed (as you will yet see more) and those Arguments (contained in the Eight *Then's*) unanswerable, it is your mistake, therefore here with others to suppose such a *Commutation* as is built upon this *Mystical Union*, when there is none but what is founded on his *Hypostatical Union*, which concerns all *Mankind*, as well as the *Elect*, and answers this full sense of *Grotius* mentioned before. Of which point in particular I will forbear saying more, because I have endeavoured to make this out in a Chapter I have in my *Peaceable Disquisitions* on Purpose against Dr. Owen; which Book I presented to the Doctor, while living, and he never writ against it. See my *Pacif.* also, *Pag.* 16, and there is some Epitomy of it.

One thing yet I will tell you in regard to those two great Points mentioned; that however commodious and proper you think these Phrases be for the making out the Doctrine of *Satisfaction*, (if you use them in no other sense than that of *Grotius*) in regard to *Sacramentism*: they are as much incommodious and dangerous, I fear, for the making out the Doctrine of *Justification* (if they be used according to the common *Protestant*) in regard to *Antinomianism*. They are

are not equally applicable, I must say, to both; for it is sufficient that Christ took on him our Nature, and so put his *Natural Person* in our room in suffering for us, to make out the one; but he must be mystically put into *our*, and we into *his Legal Person*, to make out the other.

Before I leave this Phrase, there are two Questions I must ask; One of *you*, and the other of Mr. *Rebuke*, or else your two Altercations about it will signifie nothing. The Question I would ask Mr. *Rebuke* is this; Whether he did designedly intend a Difference between a *Change of Person*, and a *Change of Persons*? Which he seems to have done by some express Words; and his meaning then must be, That tho' Christ came into the room of Sinners to suffer for them, and may be accordingly said to sustain their Persons, or to put on their Persons; yet the Sinner does not come into the room of Christ's Person, or sustain his Person, or take on him his Person; and consequently that there is a change of *Person*, but not of *Persons* between them. If this be his sense and not spoke out of a present Sagacity or Wit, but upon a deliberate Resolution, it is a great matter. I have touched upon this in my *Pacif.* and in an *Half-sheet* printed by it self. But here it may be required of Mr. *Rebuke* to shew some Author of note for such a distinction, which would fix it, but he will find none I doubt, only Mr. *Williams*; and here is the mischief of that. Mr. *Williams* denying that there is a *Change of Person between Christ and the Elect*, does account himself wrong'd, to have that interpreted, no *Change of Persons*; so that he holds a *Change of Persons*, and denies only a *Change of Person*; when Mr. *Rebuke* directly contrary allows a *Change of Person*, but denies a *Change of Persons*, and yet both intend the same sense. I on purpose noted this in that *Half-sheet* mentioned, and told there Mr. *Williams's* Sense; and I know Mr. *Rebuke* had that *Half-sheet*, and he would have done well to have quoted it; be-

cause when many Hands are required to a Work, it is better accept any meaner Hand, than * none at all. For the Question now I have to ask you Mr. *Report*, it is this: That granting you to be in the right, as to the Phrase *Change of Persons*, which these two chief

Learned Men, Bishop *Stillingfleet* for a *Conformist*, and Dr. *Owen* for a *Nonconformist*, do use and warrant; I must demand only what is your sense of it? You must tell me such a sense of this *Change*, as that the Sinner must come in the room of Christ, as well as Christ in the room of the Sinner. If you have thought on such a sense before

* This *Half-sheet* therefore shall be Printed at the end.

before you wrote, as to be fixed in it, you are a Man of *Judgment*; and if you can maintain it when fixed, you are a Man of *Might*. If you can fetch that sense out of *Stillingfleet*, that most Learned Bishop is alive, and will make it good, and it is like to be received; if you fetch it out of *Owen*, that excellent Doctor is dead, and you must make it good your self. And I would have you take heed of that, for you see Eight Arguments you must encounter; which if they be enlarged and drawn out in Battel their Strength will be great. I must also yet tell you, that in my Apprehension verily *Grotius* (whatsoever you imagine) does verge to Mr. *Rebuke* rather than you; because in his shewing, that the Proposition *arri*, when applied to Persons does import this *Commutation*, and instances in *Archelaus's* coming in the room of *Herod*; I cannot believe that *Grotius* ever once thought of *Herod's* coming in the room of *Archelaus*; so that the Point between you must come to this; that whereas you both are agreed, that *Archelaus* came in the room of *Herod*; you are to shew in what Sense *Herod* came also in *Archelaus's* room, or you are gone. In short, Mr. *Rebuke* grants you such a *Commutation of Persons*, as the coming of one in the room of the other; but not such, as the coming of both in the room of one another.

To be more clear in respect to Mr. *Rebuke*, and Mr. *Williams* in the Notion before; I will take Liberty to express my self in my own Terms. There is a Threefold Person, a *Natural* Person, a *Qualitative* Person, and a *Representative* Person. The *Natural* Person is that we call in Metaphysicks *suppositum rationale*, such as *John*, *Peter*, *You*, and *I*, which every one knows. The *Qualitative* Person is the *State* or *Condition* of the Natural Person whatsoever it is, as one Man is a *Justice*, another a *Constable*, another a *King*. If a Prince (says *Barclay*) shall go to destroy his People, *Si regnum alienet, si Rem publicam evertere conetur*, he does *exuere Personam Regis*, and he ceasing to be King, our Subjection ceases. This I bring only to shew you what a *Qualitative* Person is. A *Representative* Person, is one that in what he does or suffers, represents another, or does it in his stead; and this *Representative* Person is twofold, *Real*, or *Histrionical*. A *Real Representative* Person, is that we call a *Legal* or *Civil* Person; who is one that Acts so in another's Room, that the Person for whom he Acts; is to be accounted to have done it in his Person, it being valid, and as good in *Law*, as if himself had done it. As what an *Attorney* at Law does for his *Client*, or a *Guardian* for his
Pupil,

Pupil, it is accounted in Law to be done by *Client* and *Pupil*, so that they may in those Acts be said to *sustain their Persons*. Thus a *Parliament* is the Representative of the *Nation*. An *Histrionical*, *Fiditious*, or *feigned Person*, is one that Acts the *Qualitatives Person*, or imitates his Qualities; as the Man on the Stage that Acts a *King* or *Porter*, does *Personate* or put on the *Person* of a *King*, or *Porter*, when he is neither. Now when Mr. *Williams* in his Book, denies a *change of Person* between Christ and the Sinner (or the Elect, for the Elect are Sinners) yet grants a change of *Persons*; he must be so understood; That he denies, Christ took on him the *Qualitative Person* of a Sinner, or was so accounted of God; and likewise, that he did not Act the Part of Sinners, or do what they do, which is certainly true; and yet that there is a *change of Persons*, in regard to our *Natural Persons* betwixt Christ and us; for Christ in his natural Person came in the room of our Natural Persons, and suffered for our Deliverance. Thus much must be undoubtedly so, but as for the *Real Representative* now, there is the Question; Whether Christ took on him our *Legal* or *Civil Person*, so that we are to be look'd on, as having done and suffered in him as our *Legal Person*, what he did and suffered, whereby his *very Righteousness* must be ours in *Law-sense* for our Justification. This I take to be the Common Opinion of the Protestant, and which you have received. But this I deny. This Mr. *Baxter* denies, whether Mr. *Williams* does or no, consult his Books. My Reasons for the denial are those eight *Thens* already said, unto which more may be added. *They do heinously erre* (says Mr. *Baxter*) *and subvert the Gospel, who say that Christ's Righteousness is so imputed to us, as that God reputeth Christ to have been perfectly Holy and suffered, though not in our Natural, yet in the Legal or Civil Person of the Sinner, or Believer; as their strict and proper Representer, and so to have our selves fulfilled all Righteousness in him or by him, and thereby be justified: There are more Words by Way of Aggravation, which I fill up with [and thereby be justified.]* I know you have cited formerly some Passages, and may again, out of Dr. *Bates* against Mr. *Williams*; but I pray consider, how they are more opposite to Mr. *Baxter*; and I will therefore say thus much about them. I remember in Reading *Luther* against King *Henry*, who had wrote a Book against him, how in one or two places, upon the King's urging some Arguments of little weight, he distinguishes thus upon him. Such a thing (I have forgot what) may be taken (says he) *Dupliciter*, these

either *Revera*, or *Henericaliter*. I must answer so here, that if those Passages, or the like of Dr. *Bates* be taken *Henericaliter*, as the Words of that beloved Dr. they must pass, because he hath said them; but if they be taken *Revera* (the Expressions being Elegant, and not heeded) the Sense of them must be rightly understood, according to Mr. *Baxter*.

As for the Term *Surety* which you farther stand upon, there are many sorts of *Sureties*, Mr. *Baxter* tells you, and what kind a one, *Christ* is; which you know well enough (*Cath. Theol. Part II. p. 66.*), so that you must not take the Word, and use it in so gross a Sense as it hath been commonly, as if *Christ* and we were in the same Bond, and the Debt being paid by him, the whole Obligation is to be presently cancelled all one as if we had paid it our selves. Such a *Surety* in effect is the same thing as to be our *Legal Person*, and a *Legal Person* as such a *Surety*; and therefore upon the same Reasons not to be admitted. Besides, to have the Debt paid is one thing, and Satisfaction only made is another. *Solutio ejusdem*, and *redditis equivalentis aliter indebiti*, are two things with *Scotus*, and inconsistent with one another. *Cum alius solvit* (you know *Grotius*) *aliud solvitur*. Moreover the Term *Surety* is but once read, but the Word *Mediator* several times, and that which is more frequent, must give the Construction to the other. *Christ's Suretiship* is a *Mediatory Suretiship*, or a *Surety-Mediatorship*, and what he did and suffered for us, was not therefore strictly done in our Persons, but in the Person of a *Mediator*; and that not by Way of *Payment*, but by Way of *Satisfaction*, in Order to the obtaining our Reconciliation with God, from whence it is, that of the new Covenant he is said to be *Surety* and *Mediator*, as thereby procuring it for us. So in my *Pacif. p. 15.* And yet there is this one thing more, the most undeniable; to wit, that in whatsoever Sense he was our *Surety*, it must be such as is agreeable to the general Doctrine of the Scripture, so as to cross nothing of that it hath taught. Now that *Christ* hath redeemed all Mankind according to the Churches Catechism, that he hath dyed for all, (2 Cor. 5. 14.) for every Man, (Heb. 9. 12.) for the whole World (2 Cor. 5. 19. 1 John 2. 2.) is certain Scripture, and there must be some Sense, wherein it is to be admitted of all Hands. In that Sense therefore, or in such a Sense as is consistent with the Grace of God, that bringeth Salvation to all Men, that is, with this Doctrine, must the *Suretiship* of *Christ* be understood and received;

and in any other Sense not consistent with this *Grace of God*, or this Doctrine, it is to be Refused; as contrary to the Gospel, and all good Reason.

Thus much being said as to the *Matter*, as well as to the *Phrase of Commutation of Persons*. I will for Peace sake yield to you, and I will yield to Mr. *Rebuke* both. I yield to you, that you are in the Right as to the *Phrase*, and I will say as much for it (you shall presently see) as can be, and I yield to him, that he is in the Right as to the *Substantial Sense*; and therefore do I proceed. There are three Constructions may be made of this *Commutation of Persons*. One is, that Christ taking on him our Nature, hath dyed to satisfy the Justice of God in behalf of us, as the Sacrifices of Old; and the *Commutation of Persons* in this Sense must be understood thus, that whereas Christ was an Innocent Person, and so not liable to Suffering, and we were Sinners and obnoxious; Christ here comes in the room of the Obnoxious, and suffers, putting us in the room of him that was not obnoxious and not lyable, to escape upon the Terms of the Gospel. This Construction in short comes to this. *Christ suffers, that we might not suffer*; and this is the true and only Construction (I think) of this *Commutation of Persons*, that is to be admitted, both according to *Grotius*, and Bishop *Stillingfleet*, whom you quote for your Authority in this Matter. Another Construction may be this. The Lord Christ did suffer the Law according to you, that we may be freed from Punishment, and Christ obey'd the Law, that we might have right to Heaven. This I suppose, You (as representing the *Independent Brethren*) do hold, and there is now this *Commutation of Persons* here, that God does look on what Christ suffered and did for us, as done by Christ in our Persons; and on what he did and suffered for us, to be done by us in his Person; or more short, that, in what Christ did and suffered, God looks on it as done by Christ in *Our* Person, and by us in *Christ's* Person. Here is a *Change of Persons* who can gain say it? Especially, if it be added (as you must hold) that without this we could not have, and by this we therefore have, Deliverance from Wrath, and Right to Salvation. If Christ's Righteousness be not ours (you may urge) it cannot justify us, and if it be ours, it can be ours in good earnest in Law-sense, no otherwise. This is high, but there is a Third Construction goes farther; which is, that

as Christ stood in our Room, and put on our Person to suffer for us, so we are put into his Room to be Righteous for us, or put on his Person to stand before God for Justification and Life. Both these Constructions, whatsoever is made of them, are too much, and to be discarded upon the account of our Reasons already mentioned, and yet more. There is no such *Commutation* warrantable, but there are Texts wrested to this Sense, which must have another Interpretation. There is neither of them, but makes us justifiable by the *Law*, which subverts the *Gospel*. There is neither of them, but makes his Righteousness to justify us *formaliter*, or to be the *formal Cause* of our Justification.

This being therefore a fundamental Mistake of the *Protestant*, and the first of these Constructions being the only true Construction, it is fit I should make Answer to all that seems weighty in both the other; and do say, that when Christ hath suffered for us, and obeyed the Law for us (which others wont say, but I do) that is, not *bono nostro* only, but *loco nostro*, in this Sense, that by his Sufferings we are freed from *Suffering*, not *Castigatory Punishments*, but of the *Curse of the Law*; and by his Obedience we are freed from that perfect obeying the Law required as the Condition of Life, though not from obeying the Gospel, which requires Faith and Repentance, and good Works in Sincerity in the room thereof, and hath not obeyed the Law for us, or in our stead otherwise; the Righteousness of Christ consisting of both, his Sufferings and Obedience, is imputed to us, and made ours, though not *in se*, yet in the Effects; so that upon the account of his Righteousness, or for his Sake, we are justified: This being said, I have two things to Answer, one is in regard to your *Phrase* as Mr. *Rebuke* calls it; the other is in regard to the *Matter*.

For your *Phrase*, Christ's suffering in our Person, may be understood so as when we deserved to die, he died in our rooms, that we might not suffer but be free from it according to the first construction: Or so, as that Good looks upon us to have suffered in him, as what our *Attorney* doth, we are in *Law* accounted our selves to have done, according to the other Constructions. In the *first sense*, if you please, these Terms may be used, but not in the other. There are sundry Reasons intimated already for it, but

this more especially here at this time, because it is contradictory to the first. If Christ hath suffered that we might not suffer, then hath he not suffered that God might look on us, as if we had suffered. To suffer that we might not suffer, and to suffer that we may be accounted to have suffered, is a contradiction.

For the *Matter*, I deny not, but hold, That it is through Christ's Righteousness we are justified; yet that Faith and Repentance are not only required as the *Condition*, but when the Condition is performed, it is our *Gospel-Righteousness*; so that though it be Christ's Righteousness, is that *propter quod*, it is the Righteousness of Faith, is that *per quod* we are justified. There is therefore here a double *Righteousness*, and twofold *Concurrence* to be distinguished and received. The double Righteousness is the Righteousness of *Christ*, and Righteousness of *Faith*; the double Concurrence is a Concurrence *per modum meriti*, or *per modum cause formalis*. Now the Righteousness of Christ, I must affirm, concurs *per modum meriti*, and the Righteousness of Faith *per modum cause formalis*, to our Justification.

This is the Doctrine which, in opposition both to the *Papists*, and the Absurdity brought into it by the *Protestants*, I do maintain, as you see in my late Book, and may see farther. The *Papists* say, That Justification is by the infusion of Inherent Grace, and that *Inherent Grace* therefore is the *Form* or *Formal Cause* of Justification. The *Protestants*, in opposition to them, say, That it is by the *Righteousness of Christ* we are justified, and that it is *Christ's Righteousness imputed*, is the *Formal Cause* of it. I say, it is by neither of these, but by the *Righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel*, in opposition to *Works*, which is God's Gracious Condescension in his accepting of our Faith and imperfect Obedience through the Satisfaction and Merit of Christ unto Life, that we be justified; and that it is *Faith imputed for Righteousness*, is the *Form* or *Formal Cause* of our Justification. It is not then (I say) the *infusion* of Faith and Grace into us (which distinguishes it from the *Papists*) but it is the *imputing* that Faith and Grace infused (which distinguishes it from the common *Protestant*) for Righteousness, that is our *formal* Justification.

Alas Mr. *Report*! What an absurd thing was it at first to the *Papists*, that the *Protestants* should hold, That a Sinner was made, or accounted *Righteous* without a Righteousness, or by *another's* Righteousness, which is all one as to be *Learned* with another's *Learning*,

ing, or *Holy* by another's *Holiness*. Now let me tell you in good earnest, which perhaps you have never thoroughly reflected upon, that the same Absurdity remains if we say, That we are *Formaliter* made Righteous, or *Formaliter* Justified by Christ's Righteousness, which our former Divines having taught, we must now leave them. And one thing more, which I am more sure you never thought on, I will tell you, That the Doctrine which I substitute in the room of this, is that (I conjecture) which was indeed the very *System* of *Luther*, as appears by his words, and those of his immediate Followers I have quoted in my Book, *pag.* 10. and 20. Justification with them consists in two things, Faith in the Heart, or inchoate Obedience, and God's Imputation. Our Faith and inchoate Grace being imperfect, and so no Righteousness according to the Law, God does for the sake of Christ, or through his Satisfaction and Merits accept of it so as by his Gospel Law to impute (constitute and allow) it to us for *Righteousness*, and thereby give us Right to *Impunity* and *Salvation*. This first true notion, not sufficiently digested by *Luther*, others seeking to advance, through the interpreting it by an application of Christ's Righteousness to the Believer's *Person*, instead of applying it to his *Performance*, came to pervert it, and our former Divines took it up, and stood upon it so much against the *Papists*, that *Bellarmine* accounts the Difference with the *Protestants* about *J*ustification to be as nothing besides; and yet is this term *Form* or *Formal Cause* so much out of use of late in our present Divinity, that many of our Brethren being not sensible of their grand importance, as to the Negation of the Doctrine so held, and of the *Absurdity* in the root, they do retain the Sense without the Words, or at least maintain so much of it as the rest does follow, and yet do so seriously fall upon them that own the Consequences, that I cannot wonder, if you, and that Brother of yours that have undertaken the cause, should have such a kind of Spirit rais'd in you, as was in *Elibu*, when he was angry with *Job's* Friends, who were ready to accuse him, when they had nothing they could say without blame in themselves. *Then was kindled the Wrath of Elibu, the Son of Barachiel against Job, and against his three Friends was his Wrath kindled, because they had found no answer, and yet had condemned Job.*

There is one thing I will say therefore of that Brother of yours, which is more kind perhaps than others will, which is, That in that *Language* of his which is so *harsh*, and in that *Matter* (as quoted

ted by others) which is so *broad* that they are beyond enduring, yet do I apprehend, methinks, a *Zeal* in the one, and an *Integrity* in the other. A *Zeal* in that Heat and Wrath he hath against any that shall gainsay a Doctrine which he hath imbibed from his Youth, and places his Salvation upon; and a sincerity in that he being a rational Man and seeing more deeply than others into the Consequences of it, he scorns to baulk any of them, and so is *broad* when others *shift*, which he, I perceive, abominates. And this does prompt me therefore to say something in regard to you and him, and that *Presbyterian* Brother you both have writ against. In general, I would ask all three, Whether before reading this, you had come to any such Consideration of this Matter, that if I had ask'd you the Question, *What is the Form, or Formal Cause of Justification*, you would have given me a fix'd Answer to it? I do suppose you would acknowledge you had not, nor thought it so material to know. But you, and some greater Men than you, are out there. The Form of a Thing is that by which the Thing is, that which it is. If you know not the Form of Justification, you know not what Justification is, and when it may be known, and you don't know it; How can you tell (as another that does) what is right or wrong that you say about it? The Form does *Dare* the *Nomen* and the *Esse*, as it gives the Being, it denominates the Thing. *Justificatus* accordingly hath his *Form* passively denominating him so from *Justitia*, and that Righteousness which makes and denominates us Righteous, must be the *Form* of our Justification. Now what that Righteousness is, I have here and in my *Book* discoursed, and told it you as to my Opinion, and that of the common *Protestant*. And as for you then, and your Reverend Brother, who have, I suppose, taken up the *Protestant* Doctrine, as formerly received, without questioning whether it were sound at the bottom, or no; I would have you both, after my notice of its being forsaken of our latter more considerate Divines, to exercise that Talent, which that Brother has something above others, in looking into those *Consequences* how far they do go; and then I will conceive there is one of these two things he must come to, Either he will judge them maintainable, and the Doctrine good; and if so, let him go on, and see if he can make the *Antinomian* White: Or he will see the Consequences such, that he cannot come to that conclusion, and then he must reflect back on the Premises, and come to another, that the Doctrine must be changed; and if so,

then

then retaining his Honesty, that will not abide daubing, the Doctrine I offer in the room of his, having nothing of that kind in it, and nothing I seek by it but Truth for Truth's sake, may happily stand fair with him for the making a Convert, more likely, of one most extream from me, than of the Moderate and Wise, and consequently the Cold, that unless it came into vogue, will never concern themselves about it. And for that *Noted Brother* you two have wrote against, as differing from you in several things, especially in a sound Explication of some Scriptures, opposing the Sentiments of your Brethren; which as it gave them high offence, so it stir'd up this Brother of yours to write vehemently against him, as a Perverter of the *Protestant* Doctrine, and verging towards *Socinianism*. But he therein innocent, being not concern'd so much about that, as about the Doctrine he taught, that it might not offend, he did endeavour so to temper it with Compliance and over yielding, that made me write against him, as like to yield away our Cause. I must instance in what particular. The *Independent Brethren* accused him for holding that Christ's Righteousness was not imputed to us, but only in the Effects, when he had expressly said, *That besides the Effects the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed to a Believer*. According to the Doctrine he otherwise maintain'd, he should have held, and owned that which the Brethren accused him for; but his Words were otherwise, and he thought (I believe) that his Words and Doctrine were consistent, the Reason, indeed, being because he had not, and fundamentally could not have considered what Justification is; that is, he knew not then what the Form of it is, (nor could, my self being the first *Protestant* that have ventured here to speak out) when yet it was to be known. If Christ's Righteousness be imputed *in se*, which those Words say, then must God look upon us as Legally Righteous in him, and we Formally Justified by his Righteousness, which with the Consequence following, must drive him from his own Opinion and to come over to yours, and lead him farther even to that Party he hath wrote so well against in the First of his deservedly commended Books: So that I have more than hopes from him (when I have hopes from you) that he will, because he must, (if he writes again) come over to me, (or rather to the Apostle) in the point. *To this end came I into the World* (says our Saviour) *that I might bear Witness to the Truth.*

And:

And here I will say something to the Quick, in regard to Mr. *Williams*, that considerable Brother, and you too; for I think both more worthy Men than you do of one another. I have told you before, That I believe if Mr. *Williams* had not seen my last Book, or those Sheets, or my *Half-sheet* forementioned; and I had ask'd him, or you, the Question, What is the *Form* or *Formal Cause* of our Justification? It is like he and you would have ingeniously acknowledged both, that you had not thought so much upon it, or that it was scarce so pertinent as to be ask'd: But seeing it is like to prove otherwise to him, I must after all I have writ, and his Thoughts on it, ask the Question, *What is the Form or Formal Cause of our Justification?* I say, *our* Justification, which once for all I must tell you, does denote Justification *Passively* taken, as it must be taken, and is by *Papists* and *Protestants*, in their Dispute about it, and by the Apostle when he disputes, That it is by Faith and not Works that *Abraham* was, and we are *justified*. If one say here Justification hath no form, he is beaten plainly off the Stage. Justification, it is true, *Actively* taken, is an Act of God, a Judicial Act of him as the *Efficient*, by the Gospel as his *Instrument*, whereby he *constitutes* the sound Believer *Righteous*, and thereby gives him a Right to Impunity and Glory. As Justification then taken thus *Actively*, being an Act of God, Mr. *Williams* and you know (I suppose) that *ex parte Agentis*, it can be nothing but God's *Will*; and that his *Will* is his *Essence*; and that God acts only by his *Essence*; and that there can be no *cause* of, nor any *new Act* in God's *Essence*; and that it is in regard therefore to the *Effect*, as that *Act* is terminated on its *Object*, that God's *Will* hath that Denomination, so that it is of the *Effect*; [our being justified,] there are Causes, and a *formal* there must be as well as others: Whereas our *Protestants* now do maintain against the *Papists*, That it is the Righteousness of Christ imputed is this *Formal Cause*; I ask again of that Reverend Brother, Mr. *Williams*, Whether, according to the common Doctrine, he does hold, That the *Righteousness of Christ* imputed, and received by Faith alone, is the *Form*, formal cause, or reason of our Justification, yea or no? Here is a Question, which is *Joseph's* Divining Cup, that must tell, Whether Mr. *Williams* be a *True Man*, or a *Spy*? If he answers Categorically, either one or the other, he is a *True Man*: if he *shuffles*, he is a *Spy*. If then he says, yea, according to his Assertion, that *Besides the Effects, the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed to*

the

the Believer, then does he come to you, as the Maintainer of the commonly received *Protestant* Doctrine, and you will be pleased, I hope, with such a Proselite: If he says *No*, then must he *retract* that saying, as the good Saint *Ansin* did Many, and come over to Mr. *Raxter* and me, and be welcome to the *Truth*, as I judge. As for you then Mr. *Report*, I must ask also the same Question, (but not to have an Answer till you see I desire it;) Whether you do really joyn with the common *Protestant* in this point, as to the *Formal Cause* of our Justification? If you say you do, you see the Consequences. Take them all, draw out their Strength, try if you can answer them; One, and an Elder, Brother of yours forementioned, is so openly Honest as when he sees, to avow them; but if you begin to shrug, and must leave him, I pray consider where you can stop, unless you come to a *Third Opinion*, for you and Mr. *Williams* to reconcile in, when you have both beaten one another out of your Own.

Mr. *Report*, before I end, I cannot but speak to you of one or two things, because I look on you as one that have been as forward formerly as any for composing *Theses* for Agreement, and I am moved at those *Nine Articles* which Mr. *Rebuke* mentions upon the Resarciation of the first Breach among the Brethren, whereof the *Fifth* is of *Justification*; in which, there are (allowing the rest as unquestionable) these Words; *Not imputing Faith it self the Act of Believing, or any other Evangelical Obedience to them as their Righteousness*; which Words are such, that if you had taken care on purpose to say something for contradicting the Scripture, you could not have done your Work more effectually. *Not by imputing Faith it self, (say you) the Act of Believing, to them, for their Righteousness*; when the Scripture says expressly, *Abraham believed God, and it (it, that Act of Believing) was imputed to him for Righteousness*. Again, *Not by imputing the Act of any Obedience*; when the Scripture says expressly, *Then stood up Phinehas, and executed Judgment, and it was counted to him for Righteousness*. How could you find in your Heart, Brother, especially how could those of your *Independent Brethren*, that out of opposition to the Doctrine of that Holy and Excellent Man Mr. *Raxter*, who found fault with this in the *Savoy Confession*, find in their Hearts to compose, or cause to be composed such an Article for the Subscription of both Parties? What my Reverend Brethren! Are you for a plain Conspiracy against the Holy Scripture? What

cause have I therefore for this Doctrine of mine (not before thoroughly handled) to contradict you? The Lord of Truth be Witness between us. You may say, That not only the *Savoy Confession*, but the *Assemblies Confession* and *Catechisms* do countenance so much: I answer, If not only the Ministers at the *Savoy*, but an *Assembly*, nay the Ministers of the whole Earth could joyn in drawing up the Article of Justification in these Words, they must be all laid flat on their Backs by those of the Apostle, *And it was imputed to him for Righteousness*. Upon this account that I could not subscribe my self to such an Article, I must add, as to your way of Concord by *Theses*, I like it not. For though a Church that is Establish'd by Authority, where the Preacher is answerable for his Doctrine to his Superiours, may by such means be upheld, by their taking care that Holy Mother does *nihil detrimenti capere*, it is not so with the *Nonconformists*, whose Preaching depends on their *Liberty*, and they so divided: And therefore it is not a Union in *Doctrinals*, I apprehend, but a Union in *Practicals* and in *Love* that is adviseable; and that, not without the leaving every Man (acknowledging only the Holy Scriptures and the Three Creeds) to the Liberty of their own Opinions.

I have no more now but to let you know, that whereas the design of this Letter being the same with that of my Books, the *Middle Way*, my *Pacification*, my *Righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel*, there is a new Book on the Point coming out, or come out by the Reverend and Learned Mr. Clark, known by his *Annotations* upon the Old and New Testament; upon the occasion whereof there hath passed many Letters between him and me for the clearing this *Middle Way* which we take, or to some Difficulties appearing in it, which Letters I intend (as far as is fit) to Print, and this Paper being some Abstract of the Sense (which I could not have thus suddenly wrote, if I had not been thereby furnished) though fully comprehended by my self, it cannot be taken in by others so fully as by those Letters which have their Enlargement, and came more naturally from me; and therefore I desire you to suspend your Judgment as to the main great Matter, or *Article*, till you have read these Letters also, which I do purpose to shew to you and to Mr. Williams before I Print them; because I think that he so far as he differs from me, and you too are both out, and can be reconciled never but by a *Third way* between you that I propose; and if that be *Truth*,

I do believe so worthily of you both, that either of you will think it a greater Victory to yield to the Truth, than to overcome one another.

The Title of these Letters, when Printed, (which I hope you will find them make good) shall be this. *Letters between Mr. John Humfrey and Mr. Samuel Clark, in reference to the Point of Justification. Written upon the Occasion of Mr. Clark's Printing his Book on that Subject, before it came out, and Published by Consent, for the Vindication of that Doctrine wherein they agree, as sound, by shewing the Difference of it from that of the Papist, and the mistake of our Common Protestant. In order to an impartial and more full Understanding of that great Article, by the Improvement of that wherein they have attained, or Correction of any thing wherein they err, by better Judgments.*

Having finisht here that which I intended for Four Sheets with the *Half Sheet* at the End; the Printer gave me Notice, that there would be a Leaf or two wanting to be fill'd.

After thus much then (there being more to be said) I must acknowledge Mr. *Report*, that there is nothing wherein you can pinch Me, and Mr. *Williams*, more than by fixing on this one thing, which I suppose you do; that a *Commutation*, a *Substitution*, or *Surrogation* of one Person in the room of another, for the Doing or Suffering any thing in his behalf, must imply the Doing or Suffering that *very thing*, which the other was to do or suffer, or else it is no strict or proper *Substitution*; and consequently, that Christ (as you hold) bearing the very Punishment of our Sins, we are to be counted in him (as our *Surrogate*) to have our selves born that Punishment; seeing what is done by a *Surrogate* or *Substitute* is reckoned in Law, to have been done by him for whom he hath Officiated. Likewise Christ having obeyed the Law for us, we are to be reckoned to have obeyed; and so to be Righteous in his Righteousness, and Justified by it. For my speaking therefore something more to this; we must consider, there are Terms used by Divines and in Scripture (as that of *Surety*, once) which we are not to take *Strictly* and slavishly in their Vulgar Conception; for that were rude, coarse, and raw to do so; but they must be *Largely*, generously Construed, with the Liberty of more Accurateness and Consonancy to the Analogy of Faith; and consequently to be understood (as in our E-

thicks. we have it) *Pro ut prudens defmierit*. Upon which account I must answer, that forasmuch as you have taken these Terms. from *Grotius*; it is fit, it is reasonable, you should also take his *Sense* and meaning of them; and that is such (which you know well enough) that though he does account that there is a *Commutation*, and *Surrogation* of Christ's Person in our room in Suffering for us, that we may be freed from the Punishment; yet does he not understand it so, as that Christ did undergo the very same Punishment as due to us by the Law (and consequently your Argument failes you) but that it was an *Equivalent* to it; That it was not the *Idem*, but the *Tantumdem*; That it was *Satisfaction*, not *Payment*. That which *Grotius* vindicates is, Christ's *Satisfaction*, and if Christ had paid the *very Debt*, it would destroy *Satisfaction*. The Law was not executed on our Surety, nor on Us, but Christ satisfied the *Lawgiver* (not the *Law*) that it might not be executed; and seeing he did so, he did it not therefore, that God should look on us, as if we had our selves been punished. The Punishment the Law threatned, was on the Person that sinned, *Noxa caput sequitur*: But when Sinless Christ suffers, as that is not the *Person*, so that is not the *Thing* which is in the Threat, but while *alius soluit aliud soluitur*, as *Grotius* before has it. The Punishment threatned by the Law, includes a *Deprivation of Gods Favour*, as well as *Pain*, but Christ was not capable of that, nor of Eternal Wrath. Besides, it is not *this Law* that could lay any Obligation of Suffering on Christ that was not *Obnoxious*, but his Obligation arose from the *Law proper to him*; the Law of our *Redemption*, and his voluntary undertaking to make God Satisfaction. It was not *ex delicto*, but *ex contractu*, as you know our Divines say. And consequently, it was an Obligation, not *our* Obligation to the Punishment he took on him. If the very Debt we owed had been paid by us, or our Surety, then could there have been no *Pardon*. Punishment and Pardon are contraries. If a Man be punished or suffers the Law (in himself or *Substitute*) he is not Pardoned: If he be pardoned, he is not punished. This Suffering of Christ then for us, must not be the *same* as the Law inflicts, but an *Equivalent*, and such as God might have *refused to take*, which makes it *Satisfaction* (not *Payment*), and us capable of *Pardon*. This Doctrine of Pardon upon Satisfaction, is the sound Doctrine propugned by *Grotius*.

Thus

Thus much then for your Doctrine, now for Mr. Williams, who agrees so much with me. Our Doctrine is this, that Christ's Obeying and Suffering in our stead admits of two Senses. 1. *So in our Stead, as that God exacteth not from us that doing or suffering, yet gives us the Benefit of it.* 2. *So in our Stead as that we are legally reputed to do and suffer what Christ did, as one Civil Person with him.* In the *first* Sense, that Christ obeyed the Law, and suffered in our stead, we all agree: In the *second* Sense, I and Mr. Williams deny it, and you hold it. Here then may you argue, and I argue. That which you may argue is. If according to us, Christ obeyed and suffered *not* in our stead, so as to be one legal Person with us, then cannot what he did and suffered be legally, Ours, and then cannot his Righteousness be imputed to us *in se*, but in the *Effects* only. But Mr. Williams says, *Besides the Effects the very Righteousness of Christ is imputed to Believers.* This Mr. Williams must Answer. That which I argue is. If according to you, Christ *did* obey and suffer in our Stead, as one Civil or Legal Person with us, then as we have his Righteousness to *Justifie* us, we must have it to *Redeem* us. He that is made of God our *Righteousness*, is made our *Redemption*. But we have it not, it is not ours, to *Redeem* us, and therefore not to *Justifie* us; or therefore it is not, it cannot be *in se* imputed to us for our *Justification*. This you must Answer. For my part now, I suppose neither of you can, but that you must come off; And if so, not you to him, or he to you, but both to me, or to that *Third* way I have proposed; and do yet propose to your farther Considerations.

That the Righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel, is that Righteousness which Justifies us, there is none do Question; but what this Righteousness is, is the Question. *But now is the Righteousness of God without the Law made manifest.* It cannot be Christ's Righteousness, for this is a Righteousness *with the Law*, a perfect Conformity to the whole Law; when this is an inchoate imperfect Righteousness, that according to the *Law* is none; but made a Righteousness by the *Gospel*. In another Place the Apostle has it, *the Righteousness of God in him*; in or through Christ, and therefore not *his*. But how of God? If not that of *Christ*, who is *God*? No, for *God* and *Christ*, there are two; But of Gods Ordination, because this is the Way or Method of becoming Righteous, that God hath ordained *Under the Gospel*, as
Mr..

Mr. Clark expresses it; though I should rather say, *According to the Gospel*, for no doubt this Righteousness was under the Law, and ever in the World, or else no Man could have been saved. The Apostle therefore, after he hath said *without the Law*, does yet adde, *being witnessed by the Law and Prophets*. And what *Righteousness* is that, which hath this *Witness*? There never was Man under the Law, I am perswaded, that thought he was Righteous by anothers Righteousness, or that the Obedience of the Life and Death of the *Messiah* to come, was imputed to him as his Righteousness; whereby God held him, and dealt with him as a Righteous Person. What Man of free Thought can believe that? But if, by the *Righteousness of God*, we understand his Grace and Condescension to every sincere Person, that walked uprightly before him in accepting them to Life, notwithstanding their failings, when yet they knew not upon what account it was, as we under the Gospel; This without Question, we have every where *witnessed* in the Old Testament. There is no Place where any Pious Soul applies it self to God for his Favour, with Faith or Trust in his Goodness or Mercy, when yet he knew that if God should deal with him in Severity, he could not by the Law be justified, but that Place is a most evident witness of this *Righteousness*. That Place, which speaks of the *Word* to be *Nigh* them, and in their *Heart* (which is the *Word of Faith*, says the Apostle) does witness it. Any Place or Places, where God Promises to write the Law in their Hearts, or give them a new Heart, or put a Fear, or Love, in their Heart, if to the end that they may be saved; Any Place or Places, where it is said of the Righteous, that they *shall Live in their Righteousness*; And that Place, which says, the Righteous shall *Live by Faith*, do all witness to this *Righteousness of God*, which otherwhere is express'd *the Righteousness which is of God by Faith*, and *the Righteousness of Faith*; Faith it self, which is sound and *Works by Love* (that is all one with Evangelical Obedience) being that, which for Christ's sake God *imputes* to us for *Righteousness*, and that is, our *Justification*.

I suppose here my Sheets will be fill'd, and that I have room for no more, but this Prayer; That it may please the God of Truth to enlighten you by the Scripture, so as to have the Knowledge, and such a Sense of this *Righteousness of*
God

The Half-sheet, Writ in Reference to the Paper Printed by Mr. Report.

IN the Book of Mr. *Williams*, called *Gospel Truths*, there are two Expressions which the Brethren would have him retract : One is, *There is not a Change of Person between Christ and the Elect*. The other is, *The Father was never displeased with Christ*. I will humbly motion here a drawn Battel, or mutual Condescension ; that is, for Mr. *Williams* to withdraw one of these Passages they except against ; and, for the Brethren to withdraw the other Exception.

As for the first Passage, whatsoever is to be understood by *Commutation of Persons*, the Brethren understand thus much, That Christ put on the Person of Sinners, for these are their Words. Now Mr. *Williams*, I suppose, denies this, and they would have him retract his Denial. By *Person* therefore we are to consider, that two things may be signified, the Person of the Sinner himself, *Suppositum rationale* ; or the *Quality* or *Condition* of a Sinner, as, when a Man acts a Drunkard on the Stage, he personates Drunkenness ; if a King, he personates Majesty. Christ, GOD-Man, stood in the room of us Sinners, in what he did and suffer'd for us, *quatenus* He and we are *Supposita rationalia*, and in this first sence of the Word, Mr. *Williams* allows a *Commutation of Persons*, so as when the *Suffering* was *Christ's*, the *Benefit* was *Ours*, which is that *Grotius* intends only against the *Socinians*. But, Mr. *Williams* denies that Christ took upon him the *Quality* or *Condition* of Sinners, which is that Doctrine he supposes Dr. *Crisp* to maintain ; and that is, in the second sence of the Word, he denies what they affirm, to wit, That *He put on the Person of Sinners*. Christ did not represent or act the part of Sinners, nor was look'd on by God as a Sinner, when our Surety : A *commutatio Hominum* there was, no *commutatio Actionum*. He represented *Us* that are Sinners, he represented not *the Sinner*. A Sinner is one that breaks the Law of God, and Christ did not so, he acted no such Part, and God never

ver accounted that he did; and there is therefore no *Change of * Person*, though a *Change of Persons*, according to Mr. Williams. When in this sence therefore of the Word *Person* he is in the right, let us consider further as to the other sence of it, (as it signifies our Humane Nature, not our Sinful Nature, or Sinful Qualities) that tho' Christ did *sustain our Persons* (giving the Brethren liberty of such Words) as to what he did and suffer'd in our stead, yet there is no one such thing wherein we reciprocally *sustain his Person*, as he did *ours*; nothing whereby we are to be said or accounted to have done what he did; and therefore do I in my late Book, (*Pacif. pag. 39.*) say, That here is only a *Change of Person*, but not of *Persons*. A strange thing really, that when the same Sence is intended by me and Mr. Williams, the same Distinction used, and both say true, yet the Terms of that Distinction are contrarily apply'd by us. I must desire Mr. Williams therefore to consider, whether the use of the Word *Person* be not Foreign to our Divines, and it were not better to put what he means in such Terms as are easier of reception, and that may be only by distinguishing of Christ's taking on him our Persons, or bearing our Sins, in regard to the *Fault*, or the *Punishment*; and to say, he sustained not our Persons, or took on him our Sins *quoad reatum culpæ* (in these known Words) so as to be accounted of God a Sinner; but *quoad reatum pœnæ propter culpam nostram*, so only as voluntarily oblig'd to our Punishment. Here is the same thing in sence, and if so good an end as Re-union might be obtained by it, he may (understanding with me) retract the Words in his Book, [*There is not a Change of Person*] and grant a *Change of Person*, so long as he maintains still no *Change of Persons*, for his business is done thereby as well as by his sticking to a *Word*. The Lord Jesus, in what he did and suffer'd for us, *sustained our Persons*, (I give way to such Phrases for Peace) insomuch as we still say, That what he did and suffer'd for us was accounted by God as done and suffer'd in our room, that we might have the Benefit of it; but not accounted by him as if we had done and suffer'd in Christ's Person what he did and suffer'd for us; and so, in that respect, is there a *Change of Person*, but not of *Persons*; whereby I mean plainly, not such a Change as to makè Christ's Righteous-

* The distinction of these Terms is not made, so far as I know, by any Divines, (which excuses the Brethrens Citation of one for the other) but I use it as peculiar for explaining Mr. Williams's Sence, so that if any shall still chuse to confound them, and express our Sence otherwise, it is all one to me, and may be to him.

nels *Legally* or in Law-sence *Ours*, (or to be imputed *in se*, for that, let Mr. *Williams* know, is all one) which whoever affirms (without Shifts) let him be in as great Esteem as he will, I say, he speaks it in Ignorance hitherto of what this draws after it; To wit, that (besides the Consequences I shew, *Pacif. pag. 36.*) he makes us to be justified by Christ's Righteousness, *per modum causæ formalis*, which is an unadvised, absurd, and dangerous Position, as that ~~negator~~ *laudde* of our former great Divines, which gave the rise to *Antinomianism*. Be it known therefore to the deservedly-beloved Dr. *Bates*, and the deservedly-envied Mr. *Williams*, (for there must be something overtopping others in the Man, which is envied,) and the Worthy Brethren that drew, or signed this Paper, that here is the Point which (I believe) they have not bent their Minds to search into, so far as to be willing to speak out, and tell me if I ask, When Faith, which is our Evangelical Personal Righteousness, does concur some way with the Righteousness of Christ to our Justification, and Christ's Righteousness (we know) does concur *sub genere causæ Efficientis procatartificæ* (and *Materialis* also with Mr. *Baxter*) *per modum Meriti*, and no otherwise: What is then, let any one of them tell me, *That wherein the Formal Cause or Reason of Justification is to be*

* Justificationis formam iustitia constare certum est: *A Middle Way therefore here, between Protestant and Papist, desideratur.*

*placed, or can Justification be, or * constare, without Any?*

For this Advice now, which (according to my Natural Genius) I should have given to Mr. *Williams*, (See 1 Pet. iii. 15.) I apprehend not prejudicial to *Gospel Truth*, if his Sence is upheld, that is, the Truth of his Book, while the Quarrel about the Word be compos'd. It is plain, that Mr. *Williams*, and I, and They, hold the same thing; for he is no *Socinian*, but holds, Christ died for us in the Sence of *in our stead*; That he was our *ἀντὶ τοῦ*, importing a Surrogation of Christ's Person in our room, when he became a Sacrifice for us, which is as much (I say again) as *Gratius*, to whom they appeal, did intend. It is nothing therefore, in my esteem, for Mr. *Williams* to withdraw an Expression in that sence which offends, seeing in the *Antinomian* sence, wherein he denies a Change of Person, the Brethren agree in the *Negative* with him; and in the *Orthodox* sence, which they own, Mr. *Williams* agrees in the *Affirmative* with them. It is not Base here, but Generous, and to be Victor to give way; it being enough that they both have declared themselves. Besides, if the Brethren be in

in earnest to search into the Matter, and would order their Words so as we might come to Concord both in Words and Sence, I have chalked out here, from my late Book, this Accommodation: I will allow them a *Change of Person* in the Orthodox sence of the Word, so as to grant Christ did *sustain our Person* in what he did and suffer'd; And they shall allow to me, that there is not a *Change of Persons*, so as God did look on us to have done in Christ's Person what he did, tho' he did it in our behalf; and they shall henceforth frame their Words accordingly. And that our Brethren may bend to some Reconciliation in this Proposal, I do find, since I wrote my *Pacification*, the same Conception in Dr. Owen, *We do not say, that God judgeth or esteemeth that we did and suffer'd in our Persons what Christ did and suffer'd; but only that he did it and suffer'd it in our stead.* Of Justif. pag. 295.

As for the latter Passage, That *the Father was never displeased with Christ*; thus much must be premised and understood from what is said on the former; That in the sence he sustain'd our Persons he was made *Sin for us*, as the Apostle speaks, though he *knew no Sin*, that is to be understood *Effective*. He was not made *Sin* or a *Sinner* formaliter, but I say *effective*, in regard to the Effect of Sin, that is the bearing our Punishment, as before. Our Saviour therefore may be consider'd as bearing *our Persons* (according to these Brethren) and so our Sins; or in his *own Person*. God could not be displeased with him in the one, nor in the other Consideration, because it was of his own appointment. God, in the Punishment on his Son (not of his Son) was displeased with the *Sin* and *Sinners* whose Person he bare, but he was never displeased with the *Person of his Son*, and much less now, when he was fulfilling the Command of his Father, in giving himself for us an Offering and a Sacrifice of a sweet-smelling Savour unto him. He must have a witty Invention, I think, that can find any thing to make himself differ from Mr. Williams in this Point. And what, when they and he agree in Sence, would our Brethren have Mr. Williams retract these Words? Nay, it is *They* must withdraw here, or they may bid him next go contradict the Voice of God from Heaven, *This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*

J. H.

F I N I S.

*These Books written by the Reverend Author Mr. John
Humfrey: And to be Sold by Tho. Parkhurst, &c.
are as follow.*

Several Papers about Four or Five Sheets apiece, called the
Middle Way, of Election, of Redemption, of Justification,
of the Covenants, Law and Gospel, of Perfection, with indiffe-
reny between the Orthodox and *Quaker*: As also Peaceable
Disquisitions, which treat of the Natural and Spiritual Man, of
Praying by the Spirit, of Preaching by Demonstration of it, of
Assurance, of the *Arminian* Grace, of the Possibility of *Heathens*
Salvation, of the Reconciliation of *Paul* and *James*, of the Im-
putation of Christ's Righteousness with other incidental Matters:
One of which middle Papers, (*viz.*) That of Justification was
Reprinted two Years since, with the Quotation of what concerns
that Subject, out of the other; and since that one Sheet (so cal-
led) and his Six Sheets last Year called *Pacification*, in which
there is the Case of Non-Resistance and Passive-Obedience stated
and resolved, the Doctrine whereof abjured in the two former
Reigns, is here in this Kings Reign Recorded for a *Memoriae*
Sacrum to those which are to come. 4s^os.

The Righteousness of God revealed in the Gospel, or an im-
partial Enquiry into the genuine Doctrine of St. *Paul* in the
great, but much controverted Article of Justification. To which
is prefix the Epistles of the Right Reverend the Bishops of *Ely*,
Worcester and *Chester*. 4s^o.

A Private Psalter or Mannal of Devotion, composed by a Mi-
nister under the Apprehension of the Stone. 8s^o.

The Axe laid to the Root of Separation, or the Churches
cause against it. 8s^o.